

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

COURT OF APPEAL, FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION ONE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

GLEN ALLEN SHURICK,

Defendant and Appellant.

D053375

(Super. Ct. No. SCD213176)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of San Diego County, Michael T. Smyth, Judge. Affirmed.

Glen Allen Shurick entered a negotiated guilty plea to second degree burglary (Pen. Code, § 459)¹ and admitted he previously served three separate prison terms within the meaning of section 667.5, subdivision (b). Under the plea bargain, the prosecution agreed to dismiss one count of attempted auto theft (§ 664; Veh. Code, § 10851, subd. (a)), one count of possessing methamphetamine (Health & Saf. Code, § 11377, subd. (a))

¹ Statutory references are to Penal Code unless otherwise specified.

and one misdemeanor count of possessing burglary tools (§ 466). The prosecution also agreed to dismiss two prior prison term allegations. The parties stipulated to a five-year prison sentence. The trial court sentenced Shurick in accordance with the plea bargain.

FACTS

On April 19, 2008, Shurick entered a locked vehicle with the intent to steal it.

DISCUSSION

Appointed appellate counsel has filed a brief setting forth evidence in the superior court. Counsel presents no argument for reversal, but asks that this court review the record for error as mandated by *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436. Pursuant to *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738, counsel refers to as a possible, but not arguable, issue: whether the trial court unlawfully imposed more than one enhancement under section 667.5, subdivision (b) for the same offense.

We granted Shurick permission to file a brief on his own behalf. He has not responded.

A review of the record pursuant to *People v. Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436 and *Anders v. California, supra*, 386 U.S. 738, including the possible issue referred to by appellate counsel, has disclosed no reasonably arguable appellate issue. Competent counsel has represented Shurick on this appeal.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

HUFFMAN, J.

WE CONCUR:

McCONNELL, P. J.

McINTYRE, J.